REMARKS

This Amendment is fully responsive to the final Office Action dated October 27, 2008, issued in connection with the above-identified application. Claims 1-16 are pending in the present application. With this Amendment, claims 2, 3, 7, 8, 10, 11, 15 and 16 have been amended. No new matter has been introduced by the amendments made to the claims. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 2, 3, 6-8, 10, 11 and 14-16 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Specifically, the Examiner alleges that the above claims recite the phrase "the different command" which is unclear. The Applicants have amended claims 2, 3, 7, 8, 10, 11, 15 and 16 to clarify that the different command is "the command different from the block size setting command." Independent claims 6 and 14 appear to already recite "a command different from the block size setting command." Thus, independent claims 6 and 14 are sufficiently clear. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection to claims 2, 3, 6-8, 10, 11 and 14-16 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, claims 1-16 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saeki (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0006279, hereafter "Saeki") in view of Asami (U.S. Patent No. 6,036,100, hereafter "Asami"). The Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for the reasons noted below.

The Applicants maintain the cited prior art fails to disclose or suggest all the features recited in at least independent claims 1, 6, 9 and 14. For example, claim 1 recites the following features:

"[a]n electronic apparatus comprising:

an interface section that communicates with a host device through a command/response line and a data line, wherein:

a command and a response are transmitted through the command/response line, and data is transmitted through the data line;

the command, the response and the data are transmitted in this order between the electronic apparatus and the host device;

the transmitted data is divided into data blocks with a block size specified by the host device when a length of the data is at least a predetermined length; and

8

the interface section receives, via the command/response line, a block size setting command which informs the electronic apparatus of transmitting information about the specified block size, transmits a response corresponding to the block size setting command via the command/response line, and then receives the information about the specified block size via the data line;

a storage section that stores the received information about the specified block size; and

a data buffer that stores data, wherein

when the specified block size is larger than a capacity of the data buffer, the interface section includes error information about an inability of accepting data blocks of the specified block size in a response corresponding to a command different from the block size setting command, and transmits the response including the error information to the host device."

The features noted above in independent claim 1 are similarly recited in independent claims 6, 9 and 14.

The present invention (as recited in independent claims 1, 6, 9 and 14) is provided for responding to the information on the block size which is transmitted as data through the data line. When the block size is small, the amount of information on the block size is also small. The small amount of information on the block size can be included in the command for specifying the block size (i.e. the block size setting command) to be transmitted to the electronic apparatus from the host device.

In this case, the electronic apparatus can include error information about an inability of accepting data blocks of the specified block size in a response to the command for specifying the block size sent back to the host device because the command and the response are transmitted in order of the command and response.

On the contrary, when the block size is large, the amount of information on the block size is also large. The large amount of information on the block size cannot be included in the command for specifying the block size (i.e. the block size setting command). Thus, in the present invention, the information on the block size is transmitted as data separately from the command.

Specifically, according to the order of the command (response and data) the information on the block size is transmitted after the response. The block size is not indicated in the command but is specified in the data. The response to the command can be transmitted but the

9

response to the data cannot. Additionally, when there is an error about the specified block size, the error information also cannot be included in the response sent back to the host device. Thus, in the present invention (as recited in independent claims 1, 6, 9 and 14), the error information about an inability of accepting the block size is included in a response to a command different from the block size setting command and is transmitted.

In the Office Action, the Examiner relies on Saeki in view of Asami for disclosing or suggesting all the features recited in independent claims 1, 6, 9 and 14.

However, Saeki discloses that data is divided into a predetermined block size of data blocks and is transmitted. However, Saeki fails to clearly specify that the information on the block size is transmitted. Thus, there is a clear difference between the present invention and Saeki in that, in Saeki, data is divided into a predetermined block size of data blocks and transmitted. However, in the present invention, the information on the block size is transmitted separately from the command. Saeki fails to disclose or suggest that information on the block size is transmitted as data separately from the command.

Moreover, Asami fails to overcome the deficiencies noted above in Saeki. Asami merely discloses that error information is sent back when there is an error in data. Asami also fails to disclose or suggest that information on the block size is transmitted as data separately from the command.

In summary, Saeki and Asami (individually or in combination) fail to even appreciate the problem solved by the present invention. Thus, one of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to combine or modify the teaching of the references to arrive at the present invention, as recited in independent claims 1, 6, 9 and 14. Additionally, even if combined, the combination of Saeki and Asami fails to disclose or suggest all the features of the present invention recited in at least independent claims 1, 6, 9 and 14.

Based on the above discussion, no combination of Saeki and Asami would result in, or otherwise render obvious, independent claims 1, 6, 9 and 14. Likewise, no combination of Saeki and Asami would result in, or otherwise render obvious claims 2-5, 7, 8, 10-13, 15 and 16 at least by virtue of their respective dependencies from independent claims 1, 6, 9 and 14.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, all of the claims now active in this application are believed to be in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and favorable action are respectfully solicited.

Should the Examiner believe there are any remaining issues that must be resolved before this application can be passed to issue, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact the undersigned by telephone in order to resolve such issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Seiji NAKAMURA et al.

/Mark D. Pratt/
By: 2009.01.27 15:08:45 -05'00'
_____

Mark D. Pratt
Registration No. 45,794
Attorney for Applicants

MDP/ats
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
January 27, 2009